

## **Statement of Work**

### **Improving Web Access to EPA Grants Data**

#### **I. Background**

EPA wants to improve the quality, consistency, and completeness of the Agency grant award data provided to the public via the Web. There are three primary problems with the grants data posted to the Web. First, the same grantee organization often appears under different spellings, making it difficult to get complete grant award information on a given recipient. One of the reasons this occurs is that there is no unique identifier associated with each organization which can be checked to determine if an organization is already registered.

Secondly, project descriptions are sketchy. Despite efforts to encourage the grants community to enter more detailed descriptions in grant awards over the past several years, a significant portion of the descriptions fail to clarify what the public got for its money.

A third issue is inconsistent and incomplete information on Applicant Type (e.g., state, non-profit organization). This information is often used by organizations interested in analyzing the award information of other organizations in a similar Type category as their own.

In addition, the IGMS system, which is the source system for the data provided to the public, currently contains no Standard Industrial Classification or North American Industrial Classification data for grant recipients. Adding this data to the grant recipient record in IGMS would bring the system into compliance with EPA data standard requirements.

The contractor will provide services that address these data problems, improving the overall quality of the data and making it easier for the public to get accurate information.

#### **II. Period of Performance**

The period of performance for this project is 75 days.

#### **III. Tasks**

The contractor will be responsible for delivering services in categories A and B.

##### **A. Review Project Descriptions for Conformance to Criteria**

The contractor will review project descriptions for all active and completed but not closed out non-profit grants (about 1600 records). Project descriptions tend to be one to two paragraphs in length. Review will assess whether the descriptions conform to content criteria provided by EPA.

EPA will provide Project Descriptions to the contractor in a series of Excel spreadsheets. The spreadsheet will be organized as follows: EPA organization name, applicant type, project officer; grant number; project description; contractor assessment-match; contractor assessment - non-match; revised project description. The last three columns will be blank. The contractor will identify on the spreadsheet those project descriptions which do not meet the criteria by marking an “N” for No in the contractor assessment- non-match column. If the project description meets the criteria, the contractor will mark a “Y” for Yes in the contractor assessment - match column of the spreadsheet.

Each project description in the database will be part of a record containing other identifying information about the project. EPA will use this information to route flawed project descriptions to EPA organization units for correction.

**Deliverables:**

A1      Spreadsheet containing the contractor assessment of which project descriptions did and did not meet the criteria for content.

**B. Align IGMS Organization Data with D&B Data**

EPA will provide the contractor with a flat file of recipient organization information for each recipient organization registered in the IGMS Public Address Book. (approximately 37,000 records). The flat file will contain the following data elements: Organization Name; Applicant Type; EIN; Street Address; City; State; and Zipcode; County; Congressional District; and DUNS Number, if we have it. In the bulk of cases, the last three data elements will have no values.

The contractor will match the D&B global business database against this flat file to determine the alignment of data. This process will be completed electronically, if possible, or manually. EPA has set a threshold score of 6 to denote a minimum acceptable level for the electronic matching process. For those records that do not meet the minimum threshold score, manual matching should be done by the contractor.

After completing this matching process, the contractor will assign a unique, site-specific identifier, the DUNS Number to each record. The contractor will provide EPA with a flat file containing probable matched records including the initial data in the EPA file and value-added data elements. These elements include the minority institution identifiers in addition to the standard D&B package listed below:

- DUNS Number
- Business Name
- Tradestyle(s)
- Physical and Mailing Addresses

- Phone Number
- County
- Congressional District
- Taxpayer Identification Number
- CEO name and title
- Sales volume
- Employees here and total
- Parent/HQ, Domestic and Global Ultimate DUNS Numbers
- SIC and description
- NAICS and description

The contractor will subsequently provide EPA with a second file containing records where a match was found manually and a third file where no match was found.

### **Deliverables:**

B1 Matched file– Electronic match and append

B2 Matched file– Manual match and DUNS Number assignment

B3 File of Records With No Match– Electronic match and append

## **IV. Schedule of Deliverables**

### **A. Review Project Descriptions for Conformance to Criteria**

- A1 Database/spreadsheet containing the contractor assessment of which project descriptions did and did not meet the criteria for content.

Due: 4 weeks after receipt of file of active and completed but not closed out grants

### **B. Align IGMS Organization Data with D&B Data**

- B1 Matched file– Electronic match and append

Due: 4 weeks after receipt of EPA grantee file

- B2 Matched file– Manual match and DUNS Number assignment

Due: 3 weeks after completion of electronic matching

- B3 File of Records With No Match– Electronic or manual

Due: 4 weeks after receipt of EPA grantee file